

incredible oversight in the 260 chapters of the New Testament that no mention of such a dramatic alteration was provided.

Indeed, the author of Revelation, the apostle John, the only Bible writer to use the term, "the Lord's Day" (Revelation 1:10), mentioned Sunday twice in his gospel (John 20:1; 20:19). Both these verses refer to the day of Christ's resurrection. Surely if ever there was a time to call the first day of the week the Lord's Day, if it were appropriate, then this was the day. But John chose not to do so. Why? Because he well knew that the Lord's day was the Sabbath. Remember, John wrote his gospel between 80 – 90 A.D. If it had been his habit for 50 – 60 years after Jesus' death to address the Sunday as "the Lord's Day" he certainly would have used this term in his gospel.

In corroboration of *A Doctrinal Catechism*, The Catholic Mirror, which was the official Catholic newspaper of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, Maryland, USA, over which the eminent Cardinal Gibbons presided, stated,

The Catholic Church for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday." (1893, p. 29)

In fact, a few Christians in the mid-second century had adopted the pagan day of the Roman Empire in order to escape confusion with Jews during periods of anti-Semitism in the Roman Empire. Justin Martyr in 155 was the first to mention this practice, but it was not a general practice in Christendom and was based upon fear of persecution, not Scriptural mandate.

The Catholic Mirror states its conclusion emphatically.

Hence the conclusion is inevitable; viz., that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists, have the exclusive weight of evidence on their side, whilst the Biblical Protestant has not a word in self-defence for his substitution of Sunday for Saturday. *Catholic Mirror*, Sept. 9, 1893.

We must remember that every book of the New Testament was written decades after the death of Jesus. Eight times the first day of the week (Sunday) is mentioned (Matthew 28:1; Mark 16:2,9; Luke 24:1; John 20:1,19; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2). Not once is it referred to as the Lord's Day. Not once! The first six of these texts simply state that Christ rose from the dead on Sunday. The passage in 1 Corinthians merely admonishes the Christians to gather their offerings on Sunday.

Many Protestants, seeking to escape the Roman Catholic taunt that the acceptance of Sunday sacredness is an implied acceptance of the claimed papal authority to institute ecclesiastical festivals and precepts (laws) not found in Scripture, grasp at Acts 20:7 as the Biblical support of their Sunday worship.

Let us examine this passage of Scripture:

And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight (Acts 20:7).

There is no question that the believers met on Sunday. Unquestionably they "broke bread" on the Sunday. This fact has frequently been used as evidence that a communion service was held and thus Sunday must have been held sacred by Paul and the believers at Troas. This matter merits investigation.

Paul, the biblical record states, "continued his speech until midnight" (Acts 20:7). At about this time a tragedy occurred when a young man, Eutychus, fell asleep and fell from the window of the third loft and was killed (v. 9). Paul went downstairs and, through the power of God, Eutychus was restored to life (v. 10). Undoubtedly this procedure took some minutes, and it was the very early hours of the second day of the week (Monday) when Paul returned upstairs to the room where he had been preaching. It is pertinent to the matter under discussion to record that which occurred on that early Monday morning:

When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed (Acts 20: 11).

Thus Scripture testifies that Paul “had broken bread” on Monday morning. Yet no Christian uses this fact to support Monday sacredness. The fact that bread was broken also on Monday morning seriously diminishes the use of Acts 20:7 as evidence of Sunday sacredness.

But this is not all. What does the term “to break bread” mean? Once more Scripture comes to our aid as its own interpreter:

And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart (Acts 2:46).

Notice what this text reveals. Firstly, the early Christians, filled with the power of Pentecost, broke bread daily. So whatever the term “to break bread” meant, it provides absolutely no basis for selecting one of the seven days of the week as the special day of worship, for bread was broken on all days of the week.

Secondly, we have in this passage, clear evidence of the Biblical meaning of the term “to break bread.” In other Scripture verses, this meaning includes the participation in the communion service. But plainly, this Scripture states, in qualifying this breaking of bread, that “they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.” The word “meat” as used in the 17th and 18th centuries simply meant “food.”

But there is yet another matter that requires our attention as we seek to understand this matter. If the day upon which the communion service was conducted indicated the timing of Sabbath observance, then surely we would follow Christ’s example and keep holy the day on which He instituted this ordinance. Since the first Lord’s Supper was held on the evening before Christ’s crucifixion, such a concept would lead us to observe Thursday as our day of worship. No Chris-